

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE  
10 INSURANCE COMPANY, *et al.*,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 PETER J. HANSON, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

Case No. C16-1085RSL

ORDER REGARDING MOTION  
TO SEAL

15 This matter comes before the Court on “Defendants’ Motion to File Certain Exhibits  
16 Under Seal.” Dkt. # 67. Having reviewed the memoranda and exhibits submitted by the parties,  
17 the Court finds that the medical records and information regarding the non-party patients whose  
18 treatment is at issue in this litigation should remain confidential to protect the privacy of those  
19 patients. In addition, plaintiffs have shown that certain claims handling documents are entitled to  
20 protection from public viewing because they contain unique information, were developed and  
21 maintained in confidence at substantial cost, and would put plaintiffs at a competitive  
22 disadvantage if disclosed.

23 Docket # 70 shall remain under seal. The public, however, has a significant interest in the  
24 opinions and analysis of the experts in this litigation in that they are important to an  
25 understanding of the issues and the Court’s resolution thereof. A balance between the private and  
26 public interests can be achieved by redacting all patient names and other personal identifying  
information from Exhibits E, F, G, and H (Dkt. # 70-3 through # 70-6) and filing redacted copies

ORDER REGARDING MOTION TO SEAL

1 of those exhibits in the record. Defendants shall do so within fourteen days of the date of this  
2 Order. Defendants shall also file for public view the portions of Exhibit C (Dkt. # 70-1) that  
3 plaintiffs agree are not confidential, namely SF0000104PROD, SF0000080PROD, and  
4 SF0000081PROD.<sup>1</sup>

5  
6 Dated this 13th day of November, 2017.

7 

8 Robert S. Lasnik  
9 United States District Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

---

24  
25 <sup>1</sup> LCR 5(g)(1) requires parties to meet and confer regarding whether a designating party will  
26 Defendants' email notice to plaintiffs that they intended to file a thousand pages of documents within a  
few hours and would like plaintiffs' input on the confidentiality designations is not a meaningful attempt  
to explore alternatives to filing the documents under seal.